

## University of Groningen

### Roman Myth and Mythography

Bremmer, J.N.; Horsfall, N.

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*

1987

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Bremmer, J. N., & Horsfall, N. (1987). *Roman Myth and Mythography*. s.n.

**Copyright**

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

**Take-down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

# CAECULUS AND THE FOUNDATION OF PRAENESTE

## CAECULUS

Of all the Italian heroes that Virgil parades in his catalogue of Tumnus' allies, it was only Caeculus of Praeneste who emerged as having a native myth of his own (Ch. 1). Virgil (7. 678-81) merely mentions that he was the son of Vulcan and found in a hearth, but the Verona scholiast (on line 781) records:

Cato relates in his *Origines* that girls who were fetching water found Caeculus in a hearth and therefore considered him to be the son of Vulcan; because he had small eyes he was called Caeculus (cf. § 1). Having assembled a number of shepherds, he founded the city (Praeneste).

Virgil's commentator Servius (*ad loc.*) supplies a much fuller version of the myth. His piece illustrates the way in which ancient stories were presented at about 400 AD:

There were at Praeneste two brothers too, who were called divine (*divi*). When their sister was sitting near the hearth, a spark jumped off and struck her womb which, as they tell, made her pregnant. Later she gave birth to a boy near the temple of Jupiter and abandoned him. Maidens who were fetching water found him near a fire, which was not far from the well, and lifted him up; that is why he is called the son of Vulcan. He is called Caeculus, because he had rather small eyes — often an effect of exposure to smoke. He later collected a band around him, lived as a robber for a long time, and finally founded the city of Praeneste in the mountains. During a festival, where he had invited the neighbouring peoples, he started to exhort them to dwell with him and he boasted that he was the son of Vulcan. When they did not believe him, he appealed to Vulcan to prove that he was his son, and the whole crowd was surrounded by fire. Shaken by this sign, all stayed at once and they believed that he was the son of Vulcan.

The way in which Roman myths were ill-treated in late antiquity should warn us against accepting this account as an authentic version having the same value as that preserved by Cato. On the other hand, the possibility cannot be excluded that some of Servius' details derive from valuable sources. Unfortunately, a full study of the Caeculus myth, which would enable us to distinguish between earlier and later elements in his myth, does not yet exist, although various details of his myth have been commented upon.<sup>1</sup> We shall therefore try to elucidate the myth by analysing its various motifs in detail, just as we did in the case of Romulus and Remus (Chapter 3). Successively, we shall analyse Caeculus' birth and exposure, his education and the founding of Praeneste; and, having studied the meaning of the various motifs, we shall analyse the date of origin of the individual motifs and of the myth as a whole in the fourth and final section.

### 1. The birth and exposure of Caeculus

It is striking that we do not hear anything about the family background of Caeculus. His mother remains unknown and we hear only of the names of his uncles (§ 3), but the circumstances of

Cf. F. Altheim, *Griechische Götter im alten Rom* = Rel. Vhrs. Vor. 22. I (Giessen, 1930), 176f. 194f; F. Müller, *Mnem.* 58 (1930), 89-93, 434-436; H. J. Rose, *JRS* 29 (1933), 54f; G. Bintlir, *Die Aussetzung des Königskindes: Kyros und Romulus* (Meisenheim, 1965), 301f. 154; Momigliano, *Quarto Contributo*, 457-60 (1st ed. 1938); U. W. Scholz, *Studien zum altitalischen und altrömischen Marskult und Marsmythos* (Heidelberg, 1970), 127-29; W. F. Otto, *Aufsätze zur römischen Religionsgeschichte* (Meisenheim, 1975) 76f (1909); A. Brelich, *Tre variazioni romane sul tema delle origini*, 2nd ed. (Rome, 1975), 42-51; D. Briquel, 'En deça de l'épopée, un thème légendaire indo-européen: caractère trifonctionnel et liaison avec le feu dans la geste des rois iraniens et latins', in R. Chevalier (ed.), *Colloque l'épopée gréco-latine et ses prolongements européens* (Paris, 1981), 7-31; J. Champeaux, *Fortuna* I (Paris, 1982), 444-46. Except for Momigliano, Binder and Scholz, these studies are not very helpful.

his birth, as related in Servius' version, are to some extent paralleled by those of the birth of the Roman king Servius Tullius. Dionysios gives the following account which he found in 'many Roman histories':

They say that from the hearth in the palace ... there rose up above the fire a man's privy member, and that Ocrisia (a handmaiden but of royal descent) was the first to see it. as she was carrying the customary cakes to the fire. and immediately informed the king and queen of it. Tarquinius. they add. upon hearing this and later beholding the prodigy, was astonished; but Tanaquil, who was not only wise in other matters. but also inferior to none of the Tyrrhenians in her knowledge of divination, told him that it was ordained by fate that from the royal hearth should issue a scion superior to the race of mortals. to be born of the woman who should conceive by that phantom. And the other soothsayers affirming the same thing. the king thought it fitting that Ocrisia, to whom the prodigy had first appeared. should have intercourse with it. Thereupon this woman, having adorned herself as brides are usually adorned, was shut up alone in the room in which the prodigy had been seen. And one of the gods or the lesser divinities, whether Vulcan, as some think, or the *lar familiaris*, having had intercourse with her and afterwards disappearing, she conceived and was delivered of Tullius at the proper time.<sup>2</sup>

There is one more parallel. Promathion (*FGrH* 817), an author quoted by Plutarch (*Rom.* 2. 4). relates that Tarchetius, king of Alba Longa, also found a phallus in his hearth. Having consulted an oracle, he ordered his daughter to mount it, but she refused and told her handmaiden to cohabit with the apparition. When the king noticed his daughter's refusal, he told his daughter and the servant that they were not allowed to marry before they had finished weaving a piece of cloth. At night, however, he undid what the girls had finished during the day. This opposition proved to be of no avail and the servant gave birth to Romulus and Remus. Although the king ordered the twins to be killed, they were exposed by a servant and found by a wolf who nurtured them until they were discovered by a shepherd. Later the twin killed king Tarchetius. Earlier generations of scholars have in general accepted this story as a valid parallel but, as Gabba has shown, Promathion can hardly pre-date the first century BC. Moreover, the whole story is clearly a *bricolage* of the Penelope motif, the birth of Servius and the traditional version of the youth of Romulus and Remus, and it derives ultimately from Etruscan sources.<sup>3</sup>

Caeculus and Servius, then, were both born from the hearth, in the case of Servius even from the royal hearth. The exact nature of the hearth's sexual power was apparently the subject of discussion, as is shown by the different traditions mentioned by Dionysios. Originally, Vulcan was not connected with the hearth in Roman religion, and it is his identification with Hephaistos which must have made him a late, if obvious candidate, since female Vesta could not come into consideration. The alternative choice of the *lar familiaris* is more acceptable, since the *lares* were closely associated with the hearth. Arnobius mentions that the source for his version of Servius' birth, Flaccus (possibly the Augustan antiquarian Verrius Flaccus), identified the penis with the *cli conserentes*. This version, which may well go back to Varro, if not earlier, looks the most archaic account, but nothing else is known about these deities. The

<sup>2</sup> DH 4. 2 (tr. Thomsen); see also Ov. *F.* 6. 627; Plin. *NH* 36. 204; Plut. *Mor.* 323BC; Scholz, *Studien*, Ch. 5; R. Thomsen, *King Servius Tullius* (Copenhagen, 1980). 57-64 (with earlier bibliography).

<sup>3</sup> E. Gabba, *Entr. Hardt* 13 (1966). 147-49.

variety of gods seems to suggest that all these interpretations are secondary. The early versions of the myths will have left the sexual power of the hearth undefined.'

We have no information about the role and function of the hearth in archaic Rome, but we can compare the hearth in the Regia, the religious center of Republican Rome. Recent excavations have shown that the hearth in the Regia was most likely a product of Republican Rome when the function of the ancient, regal hearth was doubled by the enlargement, if not the installation, of the *Atrium Vestae*. Yet the building preserved 'the cults and emblems, which remained inseparable from the office and name of king and without which the state, though no longer ruled by a king, could not prosper'. It seems likely, then, that the royal hearth once was the religious center of monarchical Rome.?

In the course of time, various parallels from ancient India, the Celts and modern (fairy) tales have been adduced in order to explain the enigmatic birth from the hearth, but on closer inspection none of these parallels proves to be convincing.<sup>6</sup> Louis Gernet, on the other hand, thought that the tales derived from ancient Greece. Even though this suggestion is unlikely, he could point to some helpful parallels. In Sophocles *Electra* (417ff), Clytemnestra dreams that Agamemnon fixes his sceptre at the hearth where it grows into a branch which overshadows Mycenae. The dream, Gernet infers, closely connects royalty, the hearth and the coming of the avenging Orestes. More convincingly, Gernet also drew attention to Eleusis where among all the adult mystai, there was always one child chosen for initiation, who afterwards was called 'the boy who was initiated from the hearth' (*pais aph' hestias*). The hearth in this case was most likely the state hearth of the Athenian prytaneion. In other words, the child represented the community by his close association with the center of that community.' In the case of Caeculus we are hampered in our understanding by the lack of details about the hearth where he was conceived, but the birth of Servius Tullius can now be seen as signifying his close connection with the religious center of the Roman community. Part of the historical tradition had never forgotten that originally Servius was an Etruscan outsider who had usurped power at Rome.<sup>8</sup> The legend of his birth from Rome's royal hearth is therefore most likely to be interpreted as a later attempt at legitimising his usurpation of that power.

Having given birth to Caeculus, his mother exposed the child near the temple of Jupiter. Servius' version does not specify which Jupiter, although the god was worshipped at Praeneste under three different epithets — Puer, Arcanus and Optimus — and occupied several temples. In no way can we be certain which Jupiter his version has in mind, but we happen to know from Cicero that in the famous temple complex of Fortuna Primigenia there was a separate

<sup>4</sup> *Lares* and hearth: Cato *Agr.* 143. 2; Plin. *NH* 28. 267. Flaccus: Arnob. *Nat.* 5. 18. Variants secondary: this is rightly stressed by C. Koch, *RE* 8A (1958), 1775; Scholz, *Studien*, 129 n. 20. Scholz's conclusion (p. 139) that the 'Herdphallos' is 'der zeugende Kraft des Mars' is not supported by the texts.

<sup>5</sup> Development of Regia: F. Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano I* (Rome, 1983), 56-79; see also J. Scheid, *Religion et piété à Rome* (Paris, 1985), 62f. Quotation: F. Brown, 'New Soundings in the Regia: The Evidence for the Early Republic', *Ente. Hardt* 13 (1967), 48-64, esp. 58. On the cults in the Regia, see Scholz, *Studien*, 26-30; Dumézil, *RRA*, 183-6.

<sup>6</sup> Indian: Dumézil, *RRA*, 72 n. 1, who compares the *Mahabharata* 3. 213. 45ff (3. 14291-2) = J. A. B. van Buitenen, *The Mahabharata II* (Chicago and London, 1975), 83, and 2. 28. 20ff. (2. 1124-63) = v. Buitenen, 649. Cells: H. J. Rose, *Mnem.* 53 (1925), 410-13. Modern fairy-tales: K. Spiess, in L. Mackensen (ed.), *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Märchens*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1934/40), 112f; D. Ward, in K. Ranke (ed.), *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, vol. 4 (Berlin and New York, 1984), 1071f.

<sup>7</sup> L. Gernet, *Anthropologie de la Grèce antique* (Paris, 1968), 407f, elaborated by J.-P. Vernant, *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs*, 1965 (Paris, 1971) 11. 133-38; add now W. Burkert, *Homo necans* (Berkeley etc., 1983), 280f, with the most recent bibliography on Eleusis.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Thomsen, *King Servius Tullius*, 57-114; Momigliano, *Settimo contributo*, 417f; A. Alföldi, *Die Struktur des voretruskischen Römerstaates* (Heidelberg, 1974), 184f, improbably connects Caeculus' birth with an Eurasian Schmiedkönigtum.

sanctuary with a statue of Fortuna suckling Jupiter Puer, who, as Cicero relates, was worshipped especially by mothers. Was Caeculus supposed to have been exposed near this sanctuary?"

After the exposure of her baby, the mother disappears out of sight, but Caeculus is found near a fire by girls who are fetching water. What is the function of this second fire in the Servian version? Compared with the birth of Servius Tullius, the birth of Caeculus makes already a later, more euhemeristic impression: the miraculous phallus has been replaced by a spark from the hearth. It looks as if the second fire has been introduced to compensate for the disappearance of the phallus: the connection of Caeculus with fire receives more stress in this way.

As Momigliano has observed, the traditions about Caeculus' myth can be divided into two streams.<sup>9</sup> On the one hand, there is Servius' version in which Caeculus is miraculously born from a hearth. On the other hand, there are versions represented by Cato and the *libri Praenestini* (cf. Appendix) in which Caeculus was found in or near a fire. These latter versions look very like even more euhemeristic accounts in which the miraculous element in Caeculus' birth is gradually and completely eliminated. Instead of a birth from the hearth, there is a discovery in a fire or even near a fire. In these latter versions, the mother of Caeculus, who in the Servian version is described as the sister of the *divi*, is now replaced by maidens fetching water who nevertheless still remain sisters of these brothers. Yet Servius' account of Caeculus' birth and exposure has not preserved the original version of the myth. He underplays the role of the uncles and has borrowed the finding in the hearth, which is redundant in his version, from an alternative tradition represented by Cato. The whole of the myth can evidently only be reconstructed by putting together the various versions.

In traditional societies, girls were closely watched but their duty of fetching water often enabled them to meet males in an unobtrusive way. The encounter at the fountain thus became a commonplace in literature. The author of *Genesis* (24) already lets Abraham's servant meet Rebekah at the well, and Greek mythology supplies many examples of the encounter of the sexes at the fountain, such as Poseidon and Amymone, Boreas and Oreithyia, and Heracles and Auge. In Roman mythology, the theme recurs in the story of Rhea Silvia who is surprised by Mars when she fetches water in the cult of Vesta, just as Tarpeia meets a Gaul while performing the same duty.<sup>10</sup> In the myth of Caeculus, the freedom of movement during the fetching of water allows the maidens to stumble upon the foundling near the fire.

The fire is used in the myth to link Caeculus with Vulcan and to explain his name. Neither proposition is helpful. The connection with Vulcan cannot be very early (above) and the etymology is most improbable.<sup>11</sup> The association with *caecus* must have been irresistible to Praenestines and Romans, as also appears from Varro's mention of a different (?) Caeculus, an

<sup>9</sup> Cic. *Div.* 2, 85f, cf. H. Riemann, 'Iuppiter Imperator', *RM* 90 (1983), 233-338, and *RM* 91 (1984), 396 n. 49, who corrects various mistakes of J. Champeaux, 'Religion romaine et religion latine: les cultes de Jupiter et Junon à Préneſte', *REL* 60 (1982), 71-104, and *Fortuna*, 18.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Momigliano (n. 1), 459. For the texts, see the Appendix.

<sup>11</sup> Greek mythology and vases: Richardson on *lt. Hom. Dem.* 98ff (with earlier bibliography) and Appendix III; J. Gould, *JHS* 100 (1980), 52; E. Richardson, 'The Lady at the Fountain', in *Studi in antichità in onore di Gug. Maetzke II* (Rome, 1984), 447-454; C. Berard *et al.*, *Lo cité des images* (Lausanne, 1984), 91f with fig. 130 (both sexes) versus figs. 127-128 (females only). Rhea Silvia: Prop. 4. 4. 15; Ovid. *F.* 3. 11; DH 1. 77. 1; A. Alföldi, *MH* 7 (1950), 1-13, rep. in *idem*, *Der Vater des Vaterlandes im römischen Denken* (Darmstadt, 1971), 1-13; L. Berczelly, 'Ilia and the Divine Twins', *Acta Arch. Norv. Inst. Ser. 2*, vol. 5 (1985), 89-149. Tarpeia: Liv. 1. 11. 6.

<sup>12</sup> Both Wissowa, RKR. 231, and Rose (n. 1) have stressed the late character of Vulcan's association with Caeculus.

otherwise totally obscure Roman god, who *oculos sensu exanimet*.<sup>13</sup> It is probably also hardly chance that we find the same association with *caecus* in a story about Metellus, one of the Caecilii who derived their ancestry from Caeculus. It was related that as pontifex maximus he had saved the Palladium during a fire in the temple of Vesta in 241, but lost his sight during the rescue action.<sup>14</sup> The detail of his blindness is certainly unhistorical since Metellus was still elected dictator in 224, but it became highly popular after its invention by rhetoricians (Seneca *Contr.* 4. 2). and even inspired the notorious *Schwindelautoren* to invent Greek parallels.<sup>15</sup>

Modern scholars have preferred to explain the name Caeculus by connecting it with that of Cacus on the analogy of the couple Saetumus / Saturnus; in support of the identification, it is also stressed that both are robbers and sons of Vulcan.<sup>16</sup> However, it was always hard to see how the founder of Praeneste could have developed into a cattle thief (or vice versa), and new insights have now totally invalidated the proposed etymology. A fourth century Etruscan mirror with a seer Cacū sitting beside the youth Artile and flanked by the ambushing warriors Caile Vipinas and Aule Vipinas (cf. Ch. 3 § 5), a closely similar grouping on four second century alabaster urns, and a contemporaneous group of four urns which suggest Cacū being taken prisoner, now seem to show that the similarities between Caeculus and Cacus, which supposedly supported the etymology, are the result of a long development in which an Etruscan seer living on the Palatine was finally transformed into a cattle rustling opponent of Hercules: it is in agreement with this Etruscan origin of Cacus that, independently of these artistic arguments, the most recent linguistic analysis connects his name with other Etruscan names such as Kacena and Cacni.<sup>17</sup> It is now hardly doubtful either that Cacus' meeting with Hercules was a late poetical invention (by Virgil?) on the analogy of the Geryon episode and not a version of an Indo-European myth as scholars have been arguing since last century.<sup>18</sup> The most likely etymology of Caeculus still remains the one proposed by Schulze, who compared a group of Etruscan names such as Caecina and Caecius; representatives of this onomastic family were also found at Praeneste.<sup>19</sup>

## 2. The education of Caeculus

According to Varro, Caeculus was raised by two brothers whom Cato calls Depidii. Solinus Digidii, and of whom Servius states that they were called *divi*. Dumézil has inferred from this designation that primitive Latin mythology knew a pair of divine twins who in Rome developed

<sup>13</sup> Varro (fr. XIV. 63 Agh.) *ap. Tert. Nat.* 2. 15. I am not sure that Wissowa, *RKR*. 231, correctly identifies this god with the founder of Praeneste.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. A. Bröckel, 'Il mito nella storia di Cecilio Metello', *SMSR* 15 (1939), 30-41, with an excellent collection of texts but who, wrongly, suggests a much older date.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Ov. *F.* 6. 436-54 (who rejected the story); Sen. *Prov.* 5. 2; Plin. *NH* 7. 141; Juv. 3. 129, 6. 265; Aristides *FGrH* 286 F 15 (with the important commentary of Jacoby *ad loc.*); Derkyllos *FGrH* 288 F3; Amp. 20. 11. Courtney's comment (on Juv. 6. 265) that the story derives from a Greek model shows a fundamental misunderstanding of the value of the *Schwindelautoren*.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Altheim (n. 1), 178f, and Müller (n. 1), 91f. The fantastic etymologies of G. Camassa, *L'occhio e il metallo* (Genova, 1983), 48f, are rightly rejected by F. Bader, *Hist. of Rel.* 25 (1985), 182.

<sup>17</sup> Etruscan Cacū: J. P. Small, *Cacus and Marxyas in Etrusco-Roman Legend* (Princeton, 1982), to be read only with the review of N. Horsfall, *CR* 34 (1984), 226-9. Name of Cacus: C. de Simone, *Die griechischen Entlehnungen im Etruskischen II* (Wiesbaden, 1970), 55. Cacus in Virgil: P. Hardie, *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford, 1986), 110-8 (with earlier bibliography).

<sup>18</sup> See most recently the brilliant study by W. Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley etc., 1979), 78-98.

<sup>19</sup> Caeculus as Etruscan name: W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte der lateinischen Eigennamen* (Berlin, 1905), 75; de Simone (n. 17), 23f. Praeneste: CIL XIV 2097 (Caecius), 3076 (Caeci).

into the semi-divine Romulus and Remus.<sup>20</sup> Considering the weak position of the brothers in the Servian version, it seems more persuasive to consider *divi* to be the result of a misunderstanding of Depidii (Digidii) than to build far-reaching hypotheses on the designation. As Schulze saw long ago, the name of the brothers should be connected with Etruscan names such as Digitius or Digidius.<sup>21</sup>

The Depidii were shepherds just like Faustulus, the educator of Romulus and Remus. In Cato's version of the myth, the brothers do not enter into any special relationship with Caeculus. but in the Servian account they are his maternal uncles. This may well be a valuable detail. since there is widespread evidence that among the upper-classes of the early Indo-Europeans children often were not educated by their own parents but by their mother's brother (MoBr) or mother's father (MoFa). This upbringing by the maternal family regularly took place in the home of the maternal family. Recently, anthropologists have investigated this upbringing outside the parental home, technically called 'fosterage'. in Africa and Brazil, but their studies are clearly still at an early stage and they have not yet taken into consideration any historical material." I will therefore present here a sample of the Indo-European evidence for the upbringing of boys by their maternal family in order to show that an education of Caeculus by his maternal uncles would fit into a widespread pattern."

In the feudal world of ancient Iran. fosterage was a popular way of constructing networks of relationships which helped to support the feudal system. To this end, children of the nobility were often educated by men of a somewhat lower social position. It is only in the more marginal Iranian communities that we hear of education by the mother's family. The technical Iranian term for the fosterfather, *dayeak*, was used in Bactria and Afghanistan to denote the MoBr.<sup>24</sup> Among the Ossetes, a Caucasian Iranian community which has been repeatedly studied by Dumézil, fosterage still occurred in the nineteenth century where, as in ancient Iran. it served to sustain the feudal system. At one time, fosterage may well have taken place in the house of the maternal family as well, since in the Ossete epic the son of Uryzmag was raised in the house of the god of the waters, the father of his mother Satana." For the Hittites, evidence is scarce but we do know that they practiced fosterage. The upbringing in the house of the MoBr was perhaps not unusual, since king Labarna sighed on his deathbed that no one should anymore have a sister's son (SiSo) as fosterchild."

Greek mythology furnishes many examples of education by the maternal family. Iphidamas reached maturity in the house of his MoFa in Thrace; Neoptolemos grew up on the island of

<sup>20</sup> Dumézil. *RRA*. 264.

<sup>21</sup> Schulze. *Eigennamen*, 96. 373. Altheim (n. 1), 194f, followed by G. Radke. *Die Götter Altitaliens*, 2nd ed. (Münster, 1979). 108, improbably interpreted the name as Digiiti, ie the Samothracian Dactyli.

<sup>22</sup> See most recently E. Goody, *Parenthood and Social Reproduction* (Cambridge, 1982); eadem, 'Eltern-Strategien: Kalkül oder Gefühl?', in H. Medick and D. Sabeian (edd.), *Emotionen und materielle Interessen* (Göttingen, 1984). 360-75; C. Fonseca. 'Valeur marchande, amour maternel et survie: aspects de la circulation des enfants dans un bidonville bresilien', *Annales ESC* 40 (1985), 991-1022. I hope to return to this question elsewhere. since the isolated case of Caeculus does not allow us to study Praenestine fosterage in its social context.

<sup>23</sup> I make use of my earlier survey: 'Avunculate and Fosterage'. *J. Indo-European Stud.* 4 (1976). 65-78, but not without additions and revisions.

<sup>24</sup> Ancient Iran: G. Widengren, *Der Feudalismus im alten Iran* (Cologne, 1969), 69-82. Bactria and Afghanistan: A. Mazahéri, *La famille iranienne aux temps ante-islamiques* (Diss. Paris, 1938). 196f. Note also that in the Indian epic *Ramayana* (1. 75. 79), Bharata was educated in the palaces of his MoBr and MoFa.

<sup>25</sup> Modern Ossetes: M. Kosven. 'Atalycestvo', *Sovetskaja Ethnografija* 2 (1936), 41-62. Ossete epic: G. Dumézil, *Légendes sur les Nartes, suivies de cinq notes mythologiques* (Paris, 1931), 32f.

<sup>26</sup> Fosterage: E. Laroche, 'Le vœu de Puduhepa', *Rev. d'Assyriol.* 43 (1949), 55-78. Labarna: F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein, *Die hethitische Bilingue des Hattusili I* (Berlin, 1938), 2f; S. R. Bin-Nun. *The Tawanna in the Hittite Kingdom* (Heidelberg, 1975), index s.v. sister's son.

Scyros at the court of Achilles' father-in-law Lykomedes, and Theseus was raised by his MoFa Pittheus in Troizen. We also hear of an education by the MoBr. Bachofen opened his pioneering study of the avunculate with Daedalus' murder of his sister's son Talos. Apollodorus (3. 15. 8, tr. Frazer) gives the fullest account: Daedalus had fled from Athens, because he had thrown down from the Acropolis Talos, the son of his sister Perdix: for Talos was his pupil. Other Greek heroes, such as Odysseus and Meleager, went hunting with their maternal uncles or accompanied them in battle, and many other examples show that this educational relationship lasted well into the classical period.<sup>27</sup>

Among the ancient Germans, we find the earliest example in Wotan himself, who received his wisdom from the brother of his mother Bestla (*Havamal* str. 140). The best known example is perhaps Beowulf, who was fostered by his MoFa Hrethel (*Beowulf* 2428ff) and with whose son Hygelac he had a close relationship (261, 343 etc.). In the *Nibelungenlied* (1924ff), Etzel asks the brothers of his wife Kriemhild to take his son Ortlieb home and rear him. We meet this type of fosterage also in the Icelandic sagas. In the *Gisla saga* (c.2), Gisli stayed at home but his youngest brother Ari was fostered by Styrkar, his MoBr. Guttorm was the MoBr of king Harald and his fosterfather (*Egils saga* c.26). In the *Orkneyinga saga* (c.12), earl Sirgurd sent his son Thorfinn to Scotland to be fostered by king Malcolm, the boy's maternal grandfather. In the sagas, however, we also find a different system in which the fosterfather was a social inferior. This is well illustrated by the refusal of the English king Aethelstan to foster the son of Harald, the king of Norway, in order not to appear his subject (*Haralds saga* c.21).<sup>28</sup>

Among the Celts, fosterage occurred in pagan and Christian circles. Fiacha Muillethan was fostered by his MoFa Dill the Druid. Saint Abbanus was sent by his parents to the holy bishop Ybarus, *germanum matris sue* (*Vitir s. Abhani* c.1); similarly, the saints Aedus (*Vita s. Aedi* c.1) and Cainnicus (*Vita s. Cainnici* c.1) were most likely fostered by their maternal family. In fact, the preference for the maternal family must have been so overwhelming that it is stated in the ancient laws of Ireland: 'the kinship of the mother or the kinship of fosterage: it happens that they are one and the same'.<sup>29</sup> Fosterage or education by the mother's brother appears even as a recurrent theme in the Celtic epics of England and Ireland and in the medieval French *Chansons de Geste*.<sup>30</sup>

It seems a reasonable conclusion from this survey that the mother's brother in many Indo-European aristocracies occupied a central role in the education of his nephew. Judy Hallett has recently shown that Roman *avunculi* too, such as Atticus, Cato and Publius Rutilius, helped to prepare their sisters' sons for public life or took an active interest in their education; it will not

<sup>27</sup> For these and many other examples, see the full discussion by Bremmer, 'The Importance of the Maternal Uncle and Grandfather in Archaic and Classical Greece and Early Byzantium', *ZPE* 50 (1983), 173-186.

<sup>28</sup> On the close relationship between MoBr and Siso among the ancient Germans, see W. Aron, 'Traces of Matriarchy in Germanic Hero-Lore' = *Univ. of Wisconsin Stud. in Lang. and Lit.* 9 (1920); C. H. Bell, 'The Sister's Son in the Medieval German Epic', *Univ. of Calif. Publ. in Mod. Philol.* 10. 2 (1922), 67-182; R. H. Bremner, 'The Importance of Kinship: Uncle and Nephew in *Beowulf*', *Amsterdamer Beitr. z. ält. Germanistik* 15 (1980), 21-38. For the inferior social position of the fosterfather in the Middle Ages, see also Th. Bühler, 'Fosterage..', *Schweiz. Arch. f. Volksk.* 60 (1964), 1-17.

<sup>29</sup> Fiacha: E. O' Curry, *On the Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish II* (London, 1873), 375. Celtic fosterage: F. Kerloueapan, 'Essai sur la mise en nourriture et l'éducation dans les pays celtiques d'après les témoignages des textes hagiographiques latines', *Études Celtiques* 12 (1968/9), 101-46.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. C. Schubert, *Der Pflegesohn (nourri) im französischen Heldenepos* (Diss. Marburg, 1905); W. A. Nitze, 'The Sister's Son and the Conte del Graal', *Mod. Philol.* 9. 3 (1912), 1-32; W. O. Farnsworth, *Uncle and nephew in the Old French Chansons de geste* (New York, 1913). On medieval Fosterage see most recently G. Duby, *Guillaume le Maréchal* (Paris, 1984), 85ff; M. de Jong, *In Samuel's Image. Child Oblation in the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden, 1988), Ch. 12.



have been different at Praeneste." This educational role of the maternal uncle is an important argument, I suggest, for the priority of the Servian version of Caeculus' birth, since it is only this version that allows Caeculus to be raised by those who traditionally fulfilled an educational role, by his maternal uncles.

### 3. The foundation of Praeneste

After his education by the Depidii, Caeculus collected a band of shepherds and went around robbing for a long time. We are not told how long he stayed outside normal society, but there are various Indo-European traditions that the initiatory period of young men lasted nearly ten years. At one time, Arcadian young men had to live away from civilised society for a period of nine years as 'wolves' and they were only allowed to return if they had not eaten human flesh. Among the Anglo-Saxons, young Guthlac lived nine years as a robber before he returned to civilised society and, eventually, became a saint. Regarding the Celts, the archaic poem *Tain Bo Froich* tells how Froech lived with a following of fifty boys (a recurring number among Indo-European initiatory bands) in the wild for eight years before he came home to settle and get married. These examples may suffice to show that the period of living on the margin of society before being accepted into the body of adult men could indeed last a long time."

Dumézil has written that Caeculus 'assembled a band of youths.' He was obviously thinking of the Roman foundation myth, but the age-group which we would have expected is not mentioned in this myth, although it is evident that Caeculus' stay in the wild parallels the period Romulus and Remus spend in the company of robbers and criminals. In Servius' version, Caeculus, like Romulus, also tried to found his city during a festival by inviting the neighbouring peoples to settle with him. The founder of the city of Cures, Modius Fabidius, also collected people from the immediate neighbourhood. However, this is not as close a parallel as Romulus, since in his case there was no festival."

During the festival, Caeculus was confirmed as the son of Vulcan by a fire which surrounded the whole crowd. The manner of confirmation is totally unique, but confirmation by fire was also part of the birth legend of Servius Tullius. It was told that his head had burst out in flames when he was asleep as a child — flames which predicted his future royalty. The motif of the flames from the head occurs repeatedly in Roman tradition. During the second Punic war, L. Marcius was confirmed as a god-given leader in the eyes of his soldiers after their general had been killed, when fire emanated from his head. When Salvidienus Rufus, a friend of Octavianus, tended flocks as a boy, a tongue of flame shot up and hovered over his head, a royal portent. These signs of fire around the head are part of the Roman Indo-European heritage, as is illustrated by the nimbus around the head of the Hellenistic rulers and the *xvarnah*, the light around the head of the ancient Iranian kings.<sup>34</sup> It is with the confirmation of

<sup>31</sup> J. P. Hallett, *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society* (Princeton, 1984), 152-168, with many examples of the close relationship between the Roman MoBr and his SiSo. According to Varro, Caeculus was only a nick-name. Depidius being his real one. If, as I have argued, the Varroian version is a shortened one, it may well be that in one version of the myth Caeculus was actually named after his maternal uncles; similar cases are attested for Greece and the ancient Germans. cf. Bremmer (n. 27), 180 n. 41.

<sup>32</sup> Arcadia: Paus. 6. 8. 2; Pliny 8. 82; Aug. *Civ. Dei* 18. 17, cf. W. Burkert, *Homo necans* (Berkeley etc., 1983), 84-93. Guthlac: Felix, *Life of Saint Guthlac*, ed. B. Colgrave (Cambridge, 1956), c.18. Celts: *Tain Bo Froich*, c.1 = W. Meid, *Die Romanze von Froech und Findabair* (Innsbruck, 1970), c.1. Groups of fifty: Bremmer, *ZPE* 47 (1982), 138.

<sup>33</sup> Caeculus and age-group: Dumézil, *RRA*, 264. Cures: DH (= Varro) 2. 48, cf. Scholz, *Studien*, 162f.

<sup>34</sup> Servius Tullius: all sources in Schwegler, *RG*, 703ff; Pease on Cic. *Div.* 1. 121 (combining rather disparate material). L. Marcius (Plin. NH 2. 241), Salvidienus Rufus (Dio 48. 33. 1) and *xvarnah*: Th. Koves-Zulauf, *Reden lord Schweigen* (Munich, 1972), 249f (with excellent commentary); see also A. Alföldi, *RM* 50 (1935), 139-145; H. W. Ritter, *Diadem und Königsherrschaft* (Munich and Berlin, 1965); M. Verzar, *MEFRA* 92 (1980), 62-78.

his divine descent and the foundation of the city that Servius' account of Caeculus ends. No version mentions his death, just as no version mentions his ancestors. There is something vague about Caeculus.

#### 4. The origin of the myth of Caeculus

The vagueness about Caeculus' birth and death is only one of the puzzling aspects of his myth. There are more. Scholz has observed that the way in which Caeculus invited his neighbours recalls the Sabine rape, just as the sign of Vulcan recalls the flames around the head of Servius Tullius.<sup>35</sup> He does not draw any conclusions from his observation, but the question surely has to be answered whether Praeneste borrowed from Rome or vice versa, or whether the two cities composed their foundation myths totally independently. Let us look again at the various motifs of the Caeculus myth and compare them in detail with their Roman parallels.

We start with the birth. Servius Tullius was born from a particular hearth, and his birth served the specific purpose of legitimating his origin. Caeculus, on the other hand, is born from an anonymous hearth and his peculiar birth serves no specific function in the myth. Moreover, his origin is left totally obscure in contrast to all the heroic births we have discussed (Ch. 3, 2). After his birth, Caeculus is found by maidens who are fetching water. The reason why these girls are on their way to a well is left unexplained, whereas in the Roman myths the water is fetched by Vestal virgins for cultic reasons. Though the omission of circumstantial details may be a natural result of the processes of summarising and transmission which underlie our texts, it does remain a possibility that the omission of any motivation for the Praenestine girls is in itself significant.

After his exposure, Caeculus is raised by shepherds just like Romulus and Remus. The difference is the fact that these shepherds are his maternal uncles — the only detail in the Caeculus myth which can not be paralleled from Roman myth. Like the Roman twins, Caeculus assembles a band of followers but his band does consist of shepherds and not of an age-group as was the case with Romulus and Remus. Whereas the age-group of Romulus and Remus has numerous parallels (Ch. 3, 5), a foundation by a group of shepherds does not seem to be attested in other myths. On the other hand, we have already seen that boys were frequently educated by shepherds or had to herd themselves (Ch. 3, 3). These shepherding activities may well explain the Praenestine tradition.

As regards the foundation of the city, there can be little doubt that the invitation of the neighbouring peoples is directly inspired by the Sabine rape: the same will be true for the foundation legend of Cures. In both cases, the non-Roman versions are much flatter than the colourful Roman account. Moreover, the way in which Caeculus' kinship with Vulcan is confirmed by fire is rather suspect, since it looks inspired by the confirmation of Servius Tullius, as Scholz persuasively suggested. The conclusion seems inevitable: by the time of Servius, the myth of Caeculus had to a considerable degree become a *bricolage* of the myths of Romulus and Servius Tullius.

Having seen what the myth had become by the time of Servius, we can now turn to its earlier stages. If our analysis so far has been correct, we can reconstruct a myth which probably contained the following elements in the time before Cato.

A girl sitting near a hearth was struck by a spark in her womb. She became pregnant and gave birth to a boy whom she abandoned. Maidens who were fetching water found the boy

<sup>35</sup> Scholz, *Studien*, 129 n.18.

and gave him to the brothers of the mother. They educated Caeculus who later assembled shepherds and founded the city of Praeneste.

Even in this version, Caeculus' ancestry is left very vague and the story of his birth seems clearly inspired by the birth of Servius Tullius. However, the names in the myth and the education by the maternal uncles probably point to the existence of an original Praenestine foundation myth. Considering the Etruscan names of its protagonists, the Caeculus myth will not pre-date the Etruscan influence in Praeneste, and already at an early date it had become contaminated with the Roman foundation myth. There is perhaps one argument why we should indeed not posit too low a date for the Caeculus myth. In our analysis of the Romulus and Remus myth we have argued that in the older version of the myth the twins probably acted as cattle thieves — an activity which later generations who turned the twins into enemies of cattle thieves apparently found unacceptable (Ch. 3, 3). Caeculus, however, is still a cattle rustler, which may well mean that the Praenestines preserved a more archaic version of their foundation myth.

Why and when did the Praenestines find it necessary to incorporate elements of the Roman foundation myth? In the archaic age, Praeneste was the wealthiest city of Latium and maintained close relations with Etruria — relations which explain the many Etruscan names in Praeneste despite the fact that the population kept on speaking Latin.<sup>36</sup> The city remained independent till the fourth century when it capitulated for the first time in 380 and surrendered finally to Rome in 338. It is unlikely that during this period Praeneste felt it necessary to incorporate elements of the foundation myth of its powerful neighbours. In fact, it is not totally excluded that in the archaic age Rome was influenced by Praeneste in the development of its own foundation myth, as we suggested at the end of the previous chapter.

After Praeneste's loss of independence, Roman cultural influence immediately increased as is shown by the necropoleis and the appearance of the Roman twins on a Praenestine mirror, which, if authentic, dates from the last decades of the fourth century. However, Praeneste stubbornly tried to preserve a certain autonomy, and it even refused the offer of Roman citizenship after the second Punic war. The impressive constructions of the temple-complex of Fortuna Primigenia in the last decades of the second century illustrate its *Selbstbewusstsein* which came to an end only in 80 BC, when Sulla captured the city and massacred its inhabitants.<sup>37</sup> The Caeculus myth will have been adapted somewhere in the period between Praeneste's loss of independence and the writing of Cato's *Origines*. After the Romans had defeated the Latins in 338 their self-confidence greatly increased, as is shown by a growing number of political statues in public places.<sup>38</sup> The 'publicising' of their own foundation myth by the Ogulnii in 296 can be interpreted as another sign of this development. It may well be that the growing publicity of Rome's own myths incited the Praenestines to adapt the Caeculus myth in order to show that their own founder experienced the same adventures and the same favours from the gods as the Roman founders did. If our analysis so far is correct — but I

<sup>36</sup> Cf. A. Ernout, 'Le parler de Préneſte d'après les inscriptions'. *Mem. Soc. Ling. Paris* 13 (1905/6), 293-349.

<sup>37</sup> For Praeneste's later history and the symbolism of the temple-complex of Fortuna Primigenia, see the intriguing study by A. Ley and R. Struss, 'Gegenarchitektur: Das Heiligtum der Fortuna Primigenia als Symbol der politischen Selbstbehauptung Praenestes', *Hephaistos* 4 (1982), 117-138. Necropoleis: P. Pensabene, 'Necropoli di Praeneste'. *Arch. Class.* 35 (1983 [1986]), 228-282. Mirror: R. Adam and D. Briquel, 'Le miroir préneſtin de l'Antiquario Comunale de Rome et la légende des jumeaux divins en milieu latin à la fin du IV siècle av. J.-C.', *MEFRA* 94 (1982), 33-65, who recognise Roman influence on the Caeculus myth. Sulla: F. Hinard, in *Les 'bourgeoisies' municipales italiennes aux II et I siècles av. J.-C.* (Paris and Naples, 1983), 328f.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. T. Hölscher, 'Die Anfänge romischer Repräsentationskunst', *RM* 85 (1978), 315-357.

recognise its hypothetical character — it would show that the powerful cities of Latium influenced each other in turn.

Finally, two other examples of the impression Rome made on its neighbouring communities can perhaps be added to Praeneste. First, we have already seen that the city of Cures was also founded by inviting people from its neighbourhood. Second, Horsfall (Ch. 1) has rightly drawn attention to the fact that Coras, the name of one of the twin founders of Tibur (Verg. *Aen.* 7, 670), is evidently associated with the distant city of Cora. Taking into account the parallels from Praeneste and Cures, we may now be more confident in detecting in these twins a local invention inspired by the Roman twins (unless of course the passage is a Virgilian *autoschediasma*). In the course of this volume, we have repeatedly shown that under the impact of Rome's power the Greek *Schwindelautoren* adapted existing Greek myths or invented completely new ones. The myth of Caeculus shows that Rome had made its impact on the imagination of the neighbouring communities already at a much earlier stage of its expansion."<sup>39</sup>

J. N. B.

## PRAENESTE: THE EVIDENCE

The copious literary testimonies to the Praenestine story of Caeculus have apparently not been disentangled."<sup>40</sup>

Virgil's remark, *omnis quem credidit aetas* (*Aen.* 7, 680), is characteristic of the seductive, suggestive but not necessarily evidential authority with which learned poets of the age present stories, of varying antiquity.<sup>41</sup>

Our earliest attestation is not necessarily the mysterious *libri Praenestini* (cited by Solin. 2, 9; see below);<sup>42</sup> it is perfectly possible that there was a local chronicle, which did record the story of Caeculus,<sup>43</sup> but given the fact that Verrius Flaccus covered Caeculus in the *de significatu verborum* (for Festus, see below), it is tempting to hypothesize that Solinus' *libri Praenestini* are in fact the learned material which was included in Verrius' huge calendar there.<sup>44</sup>

That Solinus (*loc. cit.*) juxtaposes Zenodotus (*FGrH* 821 F 1) and the *libri Praenestini* proves (*pace* Letta, 430f) little: it cannot be shown that it was first Cato (so Letta 430f, n. 236) who contrasted the Greek and indigenous narratives, especially if it should be accepted that the *libri* are in fact Augustan! DH 2, 49, on the origins of the Sabines, contrasts the versions of § 1 Zenodotus of Troezen, again (F3), § 2 Cato (*Orig.* fr. 50P), and § 4 the ἱστορίαι ἐπιχώριοι of the Sabines themselves. The coincidence of method in DH and Solinus is unremarkable: it is

<sup>39</sup> I thank Fritz Graf and Nicholas Horsfall for their most helpful comments, and Professor Ph. Houwink ten Catc and Dr. L. B. van der Meer for valuable information.

<sup>40</sup> C. Letta (Athen. 72 (1984)) supposes, apparently after D. Musti (430f, n. 236, 438, n. 260) that Solinus had direct and regular access to the elder Cato, that (433, n. 236) Cato fr. 59P = Sol. 2, 9 (in fact = schol. Ver. *ad Aen.* 7, 681) and that (438) Zenodotus was earlier than Cato (which is conceivable, but in no way mandatory); the field is one in which progress may be made, but not thus.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. p. 100 on the *fama obscurior annis* and the Auruncan elders who deceptively adorn *Aen.* 7, 205ff.

<sup>42</sup> *Ut Praenestini SONANT libri* is disconcertingly the language of high poetry. No obvious parallel is cited for the form of the title: see *TLL* 7, 2, 1277, 77ff. The use of *ut fama est* in the citation is of course typical of the seductive adornments of secondary myth; cf. n. 41 and p. 6.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. p. 7 with n. 46.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Suet. *Gramm.* 17, CRF s.v.; Test. 4Fun.; Ov. *Fasti* ed. Bonier. 1, 221f; and perhaps Cic. *Div.* 2, 85 for *libri* of a calendar. Cf. Paul. csc. Fest. p. 78, 4L and *TLL* 7, 2, 1277, 12.

perfectly normal in Latin antiquarian texts of this character,<sup>45</sup> especially indeed in Varro,<sup>46</sup> but this contrasting of identified and summarised earlier narratives apparently does not occur in the extant fragments of Cato, *Origines* 2-3,<sup>47</sup> at least as identified correctly and studied dispassionately (cf. n. 40). Solinus found already excerpted in his source — probably in this case, Suetonius, *Prata*<sup>48</sup> — the variant versions of the foundations of Tibur (2. 8, citing Cato fr. 56P) and (2. 9) Praeneste. The analysis of Solinus' sources is not a simple matter — to it, Mommsen's preface, viiiff, is still the best guide — but it is to misunderstand the epoch of the author and the tradition in which his work stands to suppose that he had ever set eyes upon the *ipsissima verba* of the Censor!

The Verona scholiast to *Aeneid* 7. 681 records: *Cato in Originibus ait Caeculum virgines aquam petentes in foco invenisse ideoque Vulcani filium eum existimasse et quod oculos exiguos haberet Caeculum appellatum. hic collecticiis pastoribus urbem fundavit.* (fr. 59P; for fr. 60 see below).

The scholiast supplements this information with material drawn from Varro's *Logistoricus*, *Marius aut de fortuna*: *hunc Varro ah Depidiis pastoribus educatum ipsique Depidio nomen fuisse et datum cognomentum Caeculo tradidit libro qui inscribitur Marius aut de fortuna.*

Varro's attestations are in fact numerous and complex. To continue: at *Aeneid* 7. 680, Virgil refers to *altum Praeneste*; an etymological, not a conventional epithet;"" we should rather compare

(i) Paul. exc. Fest. p. 250. 22L, *Praeneste dicta est quia is locus quo condita est montibus praestet*;

(ii) Serv. Dan. *ad Aen.* 7. 682, *altum Praeneste: Cato (Orig. fr. 60P) dicit quia is locus quo condita est montibus praestet.*

Rarely if ever does the complex working of the transmission of the fragments of Latin antiquarian-topographical writing emerge so clearly elsewhere: Varro (*res humanae* 11) excerpts Cato, *Origines*, and in turn is used by Virgil, Verrius Flaccus (Festus), and Pliny, while the commentators on Virgil preserve the name of Cato who first recorded the etymology."" Since *Origines*, frs. 59 and 60 clearly derive from the same passage in the original, and since the latter was in all probability known to Varro, the possibility that Varro — whether in the *Marius* again, or possibly in *res hum.* 11 — was likewise responsible for the transmission of the former, ultimately to the Verona scholiast, should be considered. The *Marius*, if Dahlmann's identification" of the protagonist is correct, is up to a decade later than the *res humanae*,<sup>52</sup> but the two works could well have carried identical or overlapping information about the origins of Praeneste: certainly, given the associations of the Marii with

<sup>45</sup> Cf. below. schol. Ver. *ad Aen.* 7. 681. giving the versions of Cato (fr. 59P) and Varro: also, for instance. Serv. *ad Aen.* 7. 657. Sol. 2. 7. Vurr. *LL* 5. 43, 55. J. E. Skydsgaard. *Varro the Scholar* (Copenhagen. 1968). 101ff.

<sup>46</sup> That Varro was also the main source of DH 2. 49 is highly likely: cf. the analytical bibliography in Letta (n. 40), 433 n. 246. and E. N. Tigerstedt. *The Legend of Sparta*, 2 (Uppsala, 1974), n. 39 on 380-1. Cato fr. 51P (= Sew. Dan. *ad Aen.* 8. 638) has clearly to be dismissed from the argument; citations of Cato in the Virgil commentators can be equally delusory elsewhere: cf. *Legend of Aeneas*, n. 134.

<sup>47</sup> At this point the issue is one of method and presentation; the problem of Cato's use of Greek sources does not enter directly into it.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. K. Abel, *PW*, X A. 50. 43ff.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. G. J. M. Bartelink, *Etymologisering bij Vergilius* (Amsterdam. 1965), 54.

<sup>50</sup> B. Rehm. *Das geographische Bild des alten Italien ... Phil. Supplbd.* 24 (1932). 104ff; D. Detlefsen. *Die Beschreibung Italiens ...* (Leipzig. 1901), 56f; R. Reitzenstein, *Hermes* 20 (1885), 536f. For further argumentation. cf. Horsfall, *Encycl. Virgil. s.v. Varrone* (e l'Eneide) forthcoming.

<sup>51</sup> *Abh. Ak. Mainz* 1957. 4. 5ff/715ff.

<sup>52</sup> *BICS* 19 (1972). 120f. Cf. H. D. Jocelyn. *BJRL* 65 (1982), 165 with n. 103.

that town (cf. n. 51), it is easy to see why the *logistoricus* should have concerned itself with the story of Caeculus. It is on the other hand also clear that the *res humanae* contained some mythological material," but exactly how book 11 treated Praeneste and how much it contributed to Virgil's account cannot now be determined. It is no more demonstrable that in *Aeneid* 7. 678ff Virgil depended on Cato; neither there, nor surprisingly, elsewhere in the *Aeneid*, can specific indebtedness to the *Origines* be proved beyond question.

Varro appears to have touched on Praeneste and Caeculus once or even twice more. First. Fest. p. 38. 24L: *alii appellatos eos (sc. Caecilios) dicunt a Caecade Troiano, Aeneae comite*: Caecas may well derive from Varro's *de familiis Troianis*;<sup>54</sup> Baumerich (n. 54. 56) argues quite persuasively that what precedes — *Caeculus condidit Praeneste. unde putant Caecilios ortos* — Verrius Flaccus may have derived, like the account of the descent of the gens Mamilia of Tusculum from Telegonus,<sup>55</sup> from M. Valerius Messalla Rufus' *de familiis Troianis*. It should be noted that the Caecilii are likely to have promoted this genealogy as early as the late second century BC,<sup>56</sup> though there is no evident link between that *gens* and Praeneste. The story of L. Caecilius Metellus, blinded while rescuing the statue of Vesta during a fire in 241 BC, is probably irrelevant; it appears to be an entirely unhistorical elaboration perpetrated in the rhetorical schools.<sup>57</sup>

Secondly, the Caeculus of *res divinae* 14 (= Tert. Nat. 2. 15), fr. 63 Agahd, 159 Cardauns, has nothing, Wissowa insists,<sup>58</sup> to do with Caeculus of Praeneste. But note that the etymology given, *qui oculos sensu exanimet*, is close to those in Cato fr. 59 and Serv. *ad Aen.* 7. 678 (*quia oculis minoribus fuit*), and may reflect an etymology also given (elsewhere) for Caeculus of Praeneste.

Thus when Virgil writes (*Aen.* 7. 678ff):

*nec Praenestinae fundator defuit ur-his,  
Vulcano genitum pecora inter agrestia regem  
inventumque focus omnis quem credidit aetas  
Caeculus*

his mythological sources are, paradoxically, given the relative wealth of information about Caeculus, a good deal less clear than in some other places. Nor do the versions given by Solinus contribute to elucidate the picture: *Praeneste, ut Zenodotus, a Praeneste Ulixis nepote Latini filio, ut Praenestini sonant libri, a Caeculo, quem iuxta ignes fortuitos invenerunt, ut fama est, Digidiorum sorores*. The *libri Praenestini* have been discussed above: the Greek version, probably though not necessarily known to and rejected by Virgil, is also found at SByz. s.v. *Prainestos*;<sup>59</sup> it is probably modelled on the very well-attested story of the foundation

<sup>53</sup> (Prob.) *Comm. in Buc.* 326. 2ff. (Th.- H.), Plin. *Nol.* 3. 103. 104. 108. for instance, with Rehm (n. 50). 105; Rehm's exclusion of mythological elements from Varro's geographical writing is inexplicable.

<sup>54</sup> H. J. Bäumerich, *Über die Bedeutung der Genealogie ...* (diss. Köln, 1964), 14, 56.

<sup>55</sup> Fest. p. 116. 7L: Liv. 1. 49. 9; DH 4. 45. 1; Ov. F. 3. 97 with Bömer's note: Prop. 2. 32. 4 with Enk's note: Hor. *Iamb.* 1. 29, *Carm.* 3. 79. 8.

<sup>56</sup> T. P. Wiseman. GR 71 (1974). 155.

<sup>57</sup> T. P. Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics* (Leicester, 1979), 33.

<sup>58</sup> *PW* s.v. no. 2, RKR 231, n. 3, after W. F. Otto.

<sup>59</sup> But note that with 'Aristocles, Italica 3'. *FGrH* 831 F 1 = PsPlut. *Parall. Min.* 41 = *Mor.* 316A, one is back in the world of the *Schwindelautor* (cf. Bremmer 53 and Geese n. 56.)

of Tusculum by Telegonus,<sup>60</sup> nor is it demonstrably older than Zenodotus, who is not clearly datable! We can say only that he is earlier than Varro and Dionysius of Halicarnassus.<sup>61</sup>

The version in Serv. *ad Aen.* 7. 678 contains, from *erant illic duo fratres qui divi appellabantur* down as far as *condidit*, no new, independently transmitted and authoritative piece of information; the continuation (*et cum ludorum ... crediderunt*) is of unclear origin — though it betrays evidently the influence of, for instance, Liv. 1. 9; the passage cites no early sources and represents merely a piece of late antique pseudo-learned elaboration.

It will be noted that this discussion of the attestations of Caeculus fails to date many of them, to arrange them in a stemma, or to trace clear affiliations. That is quite conscious: such results are not permitted by the state of our evidence and it is much better not to attempt them.

## N. M. H.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. n. 55. Rehm (n. 50, 16, n. 58) unfortunately writes of Ov. F. 3. 92 and 4. 71 as though they referred to Praeneste: they do not.

<sup>61</sup> K. Abel. PW X A. 49. 67ff.